

REMARKS

Claims 9-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0042445 to Mitchell *et al.* ("Mitchell") in view of one of U.S. Pat. No. 6,583,434 to Struye *et al.* ("Struye") and U.S. Pat. No. 5,905,014 to Van de Bergh ("Van de Bergh").

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections do not properly articulate a supportable position with respect to the transmission level of stimulated emissions of a combination of filters.

As disclosed by Mitchell, preferred glass filters with multilayer coatings should provide transmission of at least 80% at the emission wavelength (paragraph [0062]). Thus, combining two of Mitchell's preferred filters results in transmission of only about 64% at the emission wavelength, which does not render the device substantially transparent in a wavelength range of the emission light, as claimed. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made based on the disclosure of Mitchell to combine the absorption filter is as claimed by Applicant.

Further, Applicant submits that the references do not support a combination of absorption filters with reflective layers as claimed. Mitchell merely discloses the use of glass filters with multilayer coatings. However, neither Mitchell nor any of the other cited references disclose or suggest the use of *reflective* layers in combination with absorption filters. Accordingly, based on the cited references, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the absorption filters with reflective layers resulting in the claimed filter characteristics. Additionally, due to attenuation of transmission by a serial

arrangement of filters, and the low sensitivity of detection, one would not further attenuate the stimulated light emissions in Mitchell by aggregating filters.


In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-20 are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis G. Plati, Sr.
Registration No. 59,153

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 7, 2008